DOCUMENT RESUME

EL 303 065 HE 022 085

AUTHOR Crosson, Patricia H.
TITLE The Study of Public Service in Higher Education. ASHE 1988 Annual Meeting Paper.
PUB DATE Nov 88
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (St. Louis, MO, November 3-6, 1988).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Policy; Higher Education; *Institutional Mission; Institutional Role; Land Grant Universities; Leadership; Organizational Development; Organizational Objectives; Personnel Policy; Politics of Education; Public Colleges; *Public Service; Resources; School Community Relationship; *School Policy; *State Universities
IDENTIFIERS *ASHE Annual Meeting

ABSTRACT

Many important institutional policy and practice issues related to public service in universities are discussed, including: (1) mission statements and definitions (formal mission statements and broad and narrow definitions); (2) organizational structures (centralization and decentralization); (3) leadership (line officer, staff officer, and other approaches); (4) personnel policies (professional service as a responsibility of all faculty members and as a responsibility of some members); and (5) resources (the paid service approach and the free service approach). For each issue area the fundamental choices experienced by universities are delineated and theoretically examined with the intention of providing the beginnings of a conceptual framework for the examination of public service in higher education. A research agenda suggests examining such things as the extent to which institutions emphasize professional service, whether leadership structures make a difference, and whether universities have shifted too far in the direction of paid service. A survey of 147 presidents of the member institutions of the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (NASULGC) (74% response rate) was undertaken to identify prevailing patterns and practices for the organization and delivery of public service in NASULGC institutions, and to find the "best" practices. Among the findings were that: 100 respondents agreed with the stated definitions and assumptions about public service, 99 of them considered public/professional service a high priority mission and function of their institution, and 30 felt their university places greater emphasis on university/corporate relations and economic development. Contains 12 references. (SM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED303065

THE STUDY OF PUBLIC SERVICE IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Patricia H. Crosson
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, Massachusetts

Paper prepared for presentation at the 1988 annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, St. Louis, Missouri.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

ASHE

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

HE 022 085

ASHE ASSOCIATION FOR THE STUDY OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Texas A&M University
Department of Educational Administration
College Station, TX 77843
(409) 845-0393

This paper was presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education held at the Adam's Mark Hotel in St. Louis, Missouri, November 3-6, 1988. This paper was reviewed by ASHE and was judged to be of high quality and of interest to others concerned with the research of higher education. It has therefore been selected to be included in the ERIC collection of ASHE conference papers.

Nearly every college or university includes public service within its statement of institutional mission. Most institutions describe an impressive array of public services in documents intended for public consumption. Public institutions are especially prone to emphasize public service activity on the occasion of submitting the annual budget request to the state legislature and/or Governor. Although many faculty members and administrators would relegate public service to a distant third place among the missions of higher education, well behind teaching and research, there is no doubt that public service is here to stay in American higher education.

The meaning of public service has shifted gradually over the years but has always been rather imprecise. From the days of the colonial colleges up through the present there has been a tendency to use the concept of service in rhetorical ways. College catalogues, presidential speeches, and the literature on higher education constantly refer to higher education's service to society, claiming, variously, that the most important service is the education of students, the search for truth and beauty, the preservation of the cultural heritage and so on. Service is being used as a synonym for contribution, and most of what occurs within a college or university contributes toward some larger social purpose or goal.

While the concept of service is still used rhetorically, the public service mission and function in higher education gradually came to denote a set of programmatic relationships and activities linking members of the campus community with organizations and groups external to the campus. The concept of public service as specialized activity is rooted in land grant ideals and the notion that state colleges and universities have an obligation to the citizens of the state which provides their basic means of support.

Over the century from 1860, colleges and universities gradually broadened and deepened their commitments beyond agriculture and the mechanic arts to almost all aspects of human life and social interaction. By the 1960's, in the name of public service, universities has assumed an obligation to help with the resolution of a host of social and economic problems and were involved in projects and activities of all kinds at local, state, and federal levels. A wide range of activities--off campus workshops and seminars, technical assistance and applied research projects, cultural events for public audiences, training programs, clinics for the diagnosis and treatment of various health disorders, community action projects and so forth were included under the rubric of public service. The primary purpose of public service activity was to extend the knowledge and resources of higher education to individuals and groups who are not ordinarily part of the campus community. Institutions called upon their faculty members to engage in public service activities in the spirit of brotherhood and good citizenship.

Over the past decade, many scholars and practitioners have begun to use the term professional service, rather than public service, in order to emphasize that university service activities are (or should be) rooted in knowledge, professional expertise, and specialized resources. Others continue to use the term public service but the connotation has shifted to professionally based public service. Public or professional service is now intended to go beyond good citizenship and community involvement. It involves the synthesis, application and dissemination of knowledge, and builds upon the expertise developed through research and instructional activities.

Universities have continued to provide the public services begun by the 1960's, but they have also taken on new professional service activities. Many have established programs with private sector businesses. Other universities, as a professional service, have launched formal research partnerships with business and industry to develop new products and new technologies. They have joined with state governments and the private sector in economic development projects. Institutions have increasingly encouraged faculty members to serve as consultants to a wide range of enterprises, and expect faculty members to receive extra compensation for these services. These new professional service activities have brought new energy and commitment and new levels of involvement to university campuses but they have also raised new questions and concerns about the role of the university and its sources of support.[1]

Those who have written on public service in higher education have been concerned primarily with the roles and responsibilities of colleges and universities and the attendant implications for the public service mission, and with articulating a contemporary meaning and purpose for public service (Bok, 1982; Lynton and Elman, 1987; Florestano and Hambrick,1984). In an examination of the role of the modern university in modern society, Lynton and Elman (1987) argue for a broadening of basic value systems within universities to recognize the importance of professional service activities as part of a larger agenda to involve universities more intimately in the knowledge needs of society. They argue that attention to the aggregation, interpretation, dissemination, and application of existing knowledge will not only strengthen the connections between higher education and society, it will reinvigorate research and teaching as well.

Only a few authors have focused on institutional policies and practices that relate to the public service mission and function, despite the fact that policies and practices influence the nature as well as the quantity and quality of public service

---

[1]From this point forward in this paper, the terms public service and professional service will be used interchhangably. The reader is asked to remember the gradual evolution of the concept.

activity. These few have concentrated on faculty reward systems (Lynton, Elman and Smock, 1985; Elman and Smock,1985). Elman and Smock (1985) address the questions of how to a) determine the quality of faculty performance in public service; b) weigh public service activities in comparison with teaching and research activities; c) document the impact of public service; and d) measure the extent of the professional application of knowledge and expertise. Institutional inability to to deal with these policy issues has been widely believed to explain the third place of public service among higher education missions and to account for negative faculty attitudes and behavior.

The purpose of this paper is to discuss a number of other important institutional policy and practice issues that relate to public service in universities, including: a) mission statements and definitions; b) organizational structures; c) leadership; d) personnel policies and e) resources.[2] For each issue area the fundamental choices experienced by universities are delineated and theoretically examined. The intention is to provide the beginnings of a conceptual framework for the examination of public service in higher education. From the examination of the choices a beginning research agenda for public service is also derived. The paper is tentative because the subject of public service in higher education is large and complex and it suffers from the absence of sustained research and scholarship. It is necessary to begin at the beginning.

THE RESEARCH PROJECT

There is surprisingly little research on public service in higher education. The literature contains many program and project descriptions and some discussions about what institutions should do but very little of this is grounded in the examination of more than one institution. This lack of research in part reflects the difficulty of getting a handle on the wealth of activity, policies, and practices that relate to public service and on the difficulty of making sense of differences across institutions.

---

[2]Other types of higher education institutions are not considered in this paper because the issues differ considerably by institutional type. Also, the research base for this paper was a study in member institutions of the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges which is made up primarily of large, public universities. Although the discussion applies directly to public universities, many of the issues are similar in private universities as well.

This paper is based on an examination of public service in the member institutions of the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges through a project supported by the Exxon Education Foundation. The National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges brings together all of the land grant institutions and all of the major state universities in the United States. These institutions make the strongest commitment to public service and have the largest array of programs and activities. They have large extension programs, continuing education units, multiple technical assistance bureaus and institutes, many health service clinics, and professional schools which have developed specialized relationships with state and local agencies.

The original intent of the research project was to describe prevailing patterns and practices for the organization and delivery of public service in NASULGC universities; to find the "best practices" in public service; and to describe both in a manual for the benefit of NASULGC member institutions.

The project was originally discussed at a special session during the NASULGC annual meeting in Fall, 1985. A survey was then sent to the Presidents of the member institutions of NASULGC.[3] The survey was intentionally brief. It asked respondents if they agreed with a given definition and set of assumptions about public service in NASULGC institutions; if they considered public/professional service to be a high priority mission and function; to describe any changes in the priority of, or leadership posture toward, public service; to describe any changes since 1980 in organizational structure, policy or practice directly related to public service; to describe what they considered to be exemplary policies, practices or programs in their institutions; and to indicate the most important problems faced by their institution in the organization and/or delivery of public service.

One hundred forty seven surveys were mailed and one hundred nine responses were returned (74%). Responses for each item varied considerably. Overall:

--One hundred respondents agreed with the stated definitions and assumptions about public service[4]

---

[3]Two NASULGC member institutions--the University of Guam, and the University of Micronesia--were excluded from the mailing because it was judged that there institutions would not share the same relationships to external organizations as the state universities in the fifty states. The survey was mailed to Presidents with a cover letter requesting that they complete it personally or forward it to the senior institutional official responsible for public service. A wide variety of individuals responded--Presidents, Vice Presidents, Deans, Associate Provosts, and Directors.

[4]The survey contained the following definition: Public service is a programmatic relationship between a college or university and external groups to bring knowledge resources more directly and effectively to bear upon the identification, understanding and resolution of public problems. The programmatic relationship will exist between the academic institutions

--Ninety nine respondents consider public/professional service a high priority mission and function of their institution. Only nine said it was not a high priority.

--Thirty respondents said their university had placed greater emphasis on university-corporate relations and economic development. Ten had strengthened relationships with elementary/secondary education and nine had expanded their continuing education unit.

--Fifty two universities had made major changes in organization, structure, policy and/or practice for public service since1980. Seventeen established major new programs or centers, nineteen made major revisions of policy or procedure, and twelve established a new senior level position, usually a vice president or associate vice president.

--Forty seven said that the most important current problem faced by their institution in the organization and/or delivery of public service is inadequate resources. Another thirty one defined the problem as inadequate faculty incentives.

Respondents were asked to share information about the public service policies and programs at their institutions. Fifty institutions sent materials back with the survey--descriptions of programs, policy booklets, collections of policies drawn from other sources that related to public service, public relations materials. The volume was overwhelming and definitely unwieldy.

The original plan to examine the descriptive materials for patterns of organization and structure and policy across institutions and for information on best practices proved impossible. Patterns could not be distinguished and "best" required judgements that were impossible to make from the information available.

The next step was to take this research dilemma to a special session of public service leaders at the 1986 NASULGC annual meeting. Participants were confident that despite the apparent disarray in the data, NASULGC universities did share

---

and external agencies or organizations, pubic and private, at local, regional, state and national levels. University knowledge resources may be delivered through training programs, workshops and seminars, continuing education, applied research, technical assistance, exchanges of personnel or other specially designed programs. Problems addressed may be related to policy in such areas as education, housing, energy, environment, government decision-making and operations, to name only a few; or the services may involve assistance with technical problems or technology transfer. Assumptions were also stated but are too lengthy to include here.

common questions, issues, and problems related to public service. These questions were identified as "a priori" or fundamental questions that must be addressed by institutions with a public service mission and commitment. The questions related to the definition of mission, roles and responsibilities, organizational structure, leadership structure, personnel and resources.

The focus of the project shifted to these questions. In each area, it appeared that institutions made basic choices and that the choices carried predictable consequences, advantages and disadvantages. The choices could be abstracted from the specifics of each institution and examined theoretically. Institutions might benefit from a discussion of the choices, and these choices would also provide a conceptual framework for the study of public service in higher education.

Over the next year, I re-examined the documents provided by NASULGC universities. I selected seven universities with interesting public service programs which also seemed to have recently addressed one or more of the "a priori" questions. I then visited each of the seven universities for at least a day. I met with public service officials, with institutional leaders and with faculty members. I endeavored to understand the particular institutional orientation to public service, the specifics of structures and policies and practices, the choices that had been made, and the perceptions concerning advantages and disadvantages of the various choices. Interviews were open-ended and unstructured. I was searching for understanding.

The full results of the project will be published by NASULGC in monograph form. For the purposes of this paper, I have drawn upon what I learned from the examination of materials and institutional visits but I make no reference to specific institutions or programs. The issues have been abstracted to the level of questions and choices as experienced by universities.

MISSION STATEMENTS AND DEFINITIONS

For public service to be considered part of the mission of a university is for service to be part of its fundamental purpose and identity, to reflect what is considered important to do, and to be embedded in aspirations and goals for the future. Mission also helps define relationships with, and obligations toward, other institutions in society. The public or professional service mission reflects an institution's recognition of its social responsibility.

Many universities develop formal statements of professional service mission in order to articulate institutional commitments and aspirations. The statements include definitions and examples of service activities as well as information about the groups intended as recipients for university services. Other institutions

develop formal definitions of professional service which specify in broad terms the nature and types of service activities, the clientele, and the nature of relationships with external groups. Still others have more narrow definitions of service which attempt to differentiate public service from research and teaching. Some institutions have both mission statements and formal definitions. A clear statement of professional service mission and/or a good definition will help institutions determine what kinds of activities to include within this function, and thus will help institutions establish appropriate structures, policies and programs.

A good statement of the mission of public or professional service and/or a good definition is not easy to formulate. Statements and definitions are often plagued by one or more of the following three problems. The first is the longstanding tendency to use the concept of service in rhetorical ways. While universities no doubt contribute in many ways that can be described as a service to society, the public service mission and function in higher education has come to mean more specific relationships, programs and activities. The failure to distinguish the more general and rhetorical "service" from the more specific public or professional service creates a problem of definition.

The second problem that complicates the effort to develop a clear statement of professional service mission is the difficulty of drawing precise boundaries around the concept. A number of research activities are intended to have short-term problem solving or practical purposes and/or respond to the priorities of various societal groups. Should these be called research, applied research or professional service? Similarly, institutions have increasingly adopted non-traditional and flexible forms of instruction such as workshops, weekend courses, external degrees, and telecommunications based delivery systems. They have expanded their student base to include adults, part-time students, and targeted work group populations. It is hard to determine where instructional activity ends and professional service begins. An attempt to establish boundaries for the concept by emphasizing differences in the intended audience (i.e. the audience for professional service is external or public constituents, that for teaching is enrolled students, and that for research is the community of scholars) also creates difficulties because it then becomes impossible to delineate with any precision which individuals and groups are external to modern universities.

The third difficulty in statements and definitions is the tendency to lump together and confuse institutional service (e.g.committee work, governance involvement); service to the discipline or profession (e.g. journal editor, elected officer of disciplinary association) and professional service. The use the term professional service rather than public service reinforces the connections to professional knowledge and expertise but it can also lead to some confusion between

professional service for the public, and professional service for the discipline or academic profession.

Formal Mission Statements and Broad Definitions

Formal statements of professional service mission and/or broad definitions of service are used to describe the purposes and objectives for professional service within the context of overall institutional mission; the intended recipients or clienteles for the service activity; and the nature and types of services to be offered. Such statements and definitions usually describe service in terms of its external or outreach orientation--the effort to make university knowledge and expertise available to external constituencies. They also describe service as oriented toward problem-solving, as the effort on the part of the university to help find solutions to the difficult and complex problems of the day. The emphasis on outreach and problem solving generally leads to a description of service activities that includes applied research activities performed for specific external agencies and instructional activities for groups not normally included in on campus instructional programs.

For the university, there are many advantages to having a statement of professional service mission and/or a statement that broadly defines professional service. Most important is the opportunity to communicate to external audiences (e.g. state and local agencies, businesses and industries, the general public) what the university accepts as obligation and what it intends to do. It also allows the university to make clear to its own faculty and administrators what is possible, desirable and expected as service activity. Since these things vary considerably across institutions according to type, size, form of control, and location, it is important for each institution to identify its distinctive service mission. Another advantage of formal statements and broad definitions of service is that they provide the opportunity to describe, and thus take credit for, a great deal of activity that demonstrates that "ivory tower" images are outmoded. One disadvantage of broad definitions is their tendency to confuse the distinctions between teaching, research and service.

Narrow Definitions

Narrow definitions make clear distinctions between service, teaching, and research and are more restrictive with the types of activity labeled public service. They are often used for accounting purposes to identify institutional expenditures, and thus it is important that there be non-overlapping categories for teaching, research and service. A major advantage of narrow definitions is improved ability to account for and monitor service activity. Narrow definitions make it easier to trace resource allocations and expenditures for public service activities. Narrow definitions with

precise and non-overlapping categories also make it easier to compare service activities across institutions. A disadvantage is that narrow definitions, by excluding externally oriented research and instructional activity, cannot be used with external audiences as descriptive devices for suggesting the patterns of university involvement with external groups. Other statements are needed to describe a universities outreach activities.

A narrow definition of public service is provided in the Program Classification Structure developed for the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems and used by many universities (Gulko 1972). The Structure creates common definitions, categories, and programs for activity in higher education and is tied to a recommended accounting structure which allows for uniformity across institutions.

> *The Public Service program includes those program elements established to make available to the public the various unique resources and capabilities of the institution for the specific purpose of responding to a community need or solving a community problem. This program includes the provision of institutional facilities, as well as those services of the faculty and staff that are made available outside the context of the institution's regular instruction and research programs.. (Gulko, 1972, p. 27)*

By excluding all activity which could be considered part of regular instruction and research activity, the Structure ends up with a small list of categories of public service activities: direct patient care; health care supportive services; community services (consultation services, provision of facilities/equipment, provision of cultural and recreational services); cooperative extension services; and public broadcasting services. The Structure also includes a set of questions to be used as guidelines for classification:

> *1. Who identified the need for the activities?*
> *2. Who initiated the activities?*
> *3. Who funded the activities and who controls the nature and content of those activities?*
> *4. Are the activities restricted to the benefit of a particular target group or are they available to anyone served by the institution?*
> *5. Would the activities be carried out by the institution as part of its normal instruction or research program if funding were not provided specifically for them? (Gulko, 1972, p. 27)*

If some identifiable external group can be named in answer to the first three questions, if the activity is to benefit a particular group, and if the institution

would not perform the activity in the absence of specific funding, then the activity can be defined as public service and included within the public service program.

The choices, then, of whether or not to formulate a public service mission statement and between broad and narrow definitions of service represent fundamental choices for universities. They help define relationships, obligations and responsibilities, and expectations and establish the framework for institutional policy and practice for public service.

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURES

Current patterns of organization and structure for professional service vary enormously among universities. Some universities have large institutes and/or centers which directly carry out most of the service activity. Other institutions have an Office or Department of Public Service which coordinates the public service activity carried out in various schools, colleges, departments, and centers. Still others define service primarily as extension or continuing education and consider these university or campus units to be their primary service units. Many universities have a large number of relatively small service entities attached to professional schools and academic departments which may or may not be coordinated centrally. Still others have only a few organized service units and expect the academic departments to organize service activity.

Questions of organization and structure are among the most frequently debated issues in most discussions and analyses of public service. Presidents and other campus leaders are looking for organizational and structural means to ensure that the quantity and quality of professional services offered are appropriate to the university mission. They seek service arrangements that can be efficiently and effectively managed. The organizational structure for public service must provide for the operation and coordination of a wide variety of activities for a diverse array of external groups and allow access to information about public services.

Different assumptions and interpretations of role and responsibility have led to differing organizational arrangements for professional service. Different institutional histories and traditions have also resulted in differing organizational arrangements. It is not possible to determine which organizational patterns and structural arrangements produce more or better professional service. Yet a fundamental issue that concerns all universities is the question of whether to centralize professional service activity and responsibility or decentralize it.

Centralization

Centralization implies a single unit with control over resources, policies, programs, and personnel for professional service. It can also imply a unit with clear responsibilities for coordinating activity in the area of service, provided that along with the responsibility for coordination, the unit has important influence over resources, policies, programs and personnel. In single campus institutions, centralization occurs at the campus level, usually in an office headed by a Vice President or Director.[5] In multicampus universities, centralization occurs at the system level, with a single office responsible for service activities on all campuses.

Centralized approaches to the organization of professional service start from the assumption that structure should follow function and that the three functions of teaching, research, and service are best organized separately. An implied assumption is that special organizational arrangements for service are needed to ensure that research and teaching do not automatically take precedence over service activity.

There are many advantages to centralization. Centralization generally conveys the image that professional service is a high priority for the university. This message is important for both external and internal constituencies. The usual motivation for change to a centralized structure is to convey a stronger sense of priority for service and to give new impetus to this function. Centralization also increases the visibility of professional service. It is much easier for external groups, and often internal ones as well, to see and appreciate service activity that is centralized. For the occasional project, visibility may turn out to be a disadvantage, but for most service activity, visibility has obvious benefits for the university.

Another advantage is that centralized units, whether at multicampus or campus levels, are able to call upon faculty from throughout the institution. They can bring together teams of individuals from different areas and create the correct mix of knowledge and expertise for particular service projects. They create opportunities for genuine multidisciplinary approaches.

Centralization does not guarantee, but increases the likelihood, that clear and consistent policies for professional service will be developed. It is relatively easy for centralized units to develop personnel and resource allocation policies to handle routine business, establish policies for faculty involvement, and develop patterns

---

[5] It is also possible to centralize at the School or College level, with an office under a Dean taking responsibility for service activities throughout the School or College. The campus level is used here, however, to denote centralization.

for working with external constituencies. It is also easier to manage centralized structures. A centralized office can develop and monitor service activities, check on external constituent satisfaction, and institute procedural controls and evaluation systems to ensure the effective use of resources.

There are also disadvantages to centralized approaches. Although many centralized structures start with the intention of drawing upon the full spectrum of university expertise, over time they have a tendency to become self contained units in which all service activities and initiatives are taken by a small full time staff. Faculty members in academic departments respond to departmental pressures for teaching, research and publication and often do not become involved in service activities organized by centralized units. Thus, somewhat paradoxically, centralized units can also end up reducing the amount of professional service activity.

The separation of service from ongoing teaching and research activities can also be seen as a disadvantage. Professional service should extend knowledge and expertise which is developed and honed through research and teaching to the public arena. Separate service units may lose touch with current developments and concerns of academic disciplines and professional fields and thus provide less effective service to external constituencies.

Decentralization

Decentralization implies dispersion of professional service responsibility and activity throughout the institution, usually through the academic structure. The approach assumes that service activities should be closely related to the teaching and research activities of the campus and that professional service activity will be increased or improved through closer association with the day to day activities of faculty members.

In decentralized approaches, decision-making power about service policies and practices, authority for resource allocations, and responsibility to encourage service activity are added to the other responsibilities of Chancellors, Provosts, Deans, Department Chairs, Directors and/or faculty groups. There may be campus wide guidelines for service and there may even be a central office with a coordinating role, but the basic responsibility
resides with the various academic units.

There are many advantages to decentralized approaches. When service responsibility is decentralized to the department level, expectations for professional service emanate from the same source as expectations for research and instruction. The three functions can be balanced and mutually reinforcing and

faculty members are less likely to feel constrained by competing pressures. It is also easier to involve graduate and undergraduate students in departmentally based service activities and thus professional service can be used to enhance and reinforce the teaching mission.

From a management perspective, reward systems are easier to design and enforce with consistency in decentralized approaches. Decentralized service can allow for flexible and individualized responses to the particular needs of external groups. For example, the Business School can offer associates programs and applied research projects, while Education and Engineering can engage in in-service and training activities. Each unit has the flexibility to design appropriate service activities. Schools and colleges can build multidisciplinary activity by drawing together faculty members with similar intellectual interests and shared commitments but differing approaches.

The disadvantages of decentralized approaches include the loss of a certain amount of campus and external visibility for the professional service mission, and increased difficulty for external groups in making connections with service providers within the institution. Also, decentralized structures depend upon the commitment, enthusiasm, and ability of academic leaders. Without strong deans, department chairs and other officers willing to defend and encourage professional service, it becomes that distant third priority which inspires rhetoric but little action. At present, university academic leaders are not chosen for their commitments to professional service, and it is often given little attention and support.

There are some management disadvantages as well. Economies of scale that are possible in large centralized structures can be lost in decentralized units. It can be difficult for decentralized units to muster the resources for many specialized tasks such as data analysis, report and proposal preparation, and sustained communication with external groups. It can also be difficult to develop and implement consistent policies and procedures across a large number of decentralized service units.

In providing an organizational structure for the public service mission and function, then, university leaders face a difficult choice between centralization and decentralization. Each path has advantages and disadvantages. While universities in practice often mix centralized and decentralized elements in their structures, it is helpful to clarify the implications of the choices.

LEADERSHIP

University presidents provide the essential leadership for professional service. They articulate the service mission and value commitments of the institution and symbolize attitudes and orientations toward professional service. They help shape service policies and practices.

University presidents also provide for the basic leadership structure of the institution through delineations of roles, responsibilities, titles and authority relationships for administrative officers. They determine who will carry line responsibility for the professional service function, and if there should be a staff assignment for professional service. They stipulate and/or endorse specific duties and assignments for administrative officers. Through these actions they set an overall tone for professional service, establish expectations, and influence behavior.

There are many choices for leadership structure and line/staff delineations including: (1) appoint a senior line officer for professional service with the title of Vice President or Vice Chancellor; (2) designate a staff officer under an academic or other senior line officer to coordinate professional service activities (various titles could be used such as Associate Provost or Assistant to the President); (3) name an officer with line responsibilities and mid-level seniority to direct a centralized service office (e.g. Director, Office of Public Service); or (4) informally assign a spokesman or advocacy role to the leader of an existing organized service unit (e.g. Director of University Extension, Director of Continuing Education). In a service structure totally decentralized through the academic structure, a fifth choice would be to make no special assignment to the service function but to assume that professional service leadership is among the responsibilities of all line academic officers.

Examples of each leadership structure can currently be found in universities. As with organizational structure, it has not been determined which formulation for leadership works best. The answer appears to depend on traditions and patterns in each university and on the personalities and capabilities of individuals in leadership positions. It is often argued that personal characteristics and leadership style as well as energy, commitment and vision are far more important to actual leadership than are titles, formal authority, or specifications of duties and responsibilities. While this may well be the case, the President still must establish the underlying leadership structure for the professional service function. In essence this requires a choice between staff and line approaches to leadership.

Line Officer Approach

Institutions that choose to appoint an officer with line responsibilities for professional service assume that a specific leadership assignment will invigorate the service function, provide for its management, and testify to the importance of professional service as part of the institutional mission. Such an appointment is usually made at the campus rather than system level. The line officer can be given the title of Vice President (or Vice Chancellor in those campuses headed by a Chancellor) or Director. Vice President implies equal status with other vice presidents (e.g. for academic affairs, student affairs, administration and finance), and a direct reporting line to the President. The title of Director suggests a reporting line to one of the Vice Presidents (usually academic affairs), and equal status with other Directors (e.g. the Director of the Library, Director of Admissions and Financial Aid). The more senior the title, the more important the function is presumed to be.

A senior line officer for professional service, Vice President or Director, is usually expected to:

1. Represent and serve as a spokesperson for the university in discussions with external groups about public/professional service.

2. Act as an internal advocate and spokesman for professional service; represent the service function to internal constituencies.

3. Become involved in plans and negotiations for major professional service activities. Find creative ways to encourage professional service.

4. Take responsibility for formulating policy and guidelines for professional service within campus and university governance structures.

5. Assume responsibility for fiscal decisions in the area of professional service. For example, the officer would develop the service budget request, make decisions and/or recommendations concerning the allocation of resources for service activities to various campus units, and develop appropriate fee structures for service activities.

6. Take responsibility for personnel policies and actions affecting full time service professionals (e.g. recruitment, appointment, performance review, promotion, salary and merit determination).

7. Provide assessments of faculty performance in professional service to the appropriate academic bodies for purposes of reappointment, promotion, tenure, and merit review.

The precise combination of these duties and responsibilities, and the priorities among them, will vary with specific institutional structures and circumstances and with the predilections and priorities of the individuals who occupy the positions.

There are many advantages associated with having a senior line officer for professional service, some of which parallel those for centralized structures described in the previous section. A line officer for professional service conveys a message to internal and external audiences that service is a high priority for the university. A line officer provides representation for the university with external constituencies and can serve as a powerful advocate for professional service in internal deliberations of policy and resource allocation. Management of the service function can also be improved as a line officer is able to devote full time and attention to the development and implementation of policy and to the design and delivery of service projects.

There are, however, disadvantages to the senior line officer approach to leadership. It is difficult, in practice, to separate the line responsibilities of service officers from those of the academic officers. Unless the university creates a totally separate professional staff for service, both academic and service officers work with deans, department chairs, faculty members and professional staff. Serious role conflicts can develop between officers. Academic and service officers can send mixed messages and hold differing expectations for faculty and staff. The difficulty of making clear distinctions between research, teaching, and service simply exacerbates the problem.
It can also be argued that adding an expensive senior officer (and the inevitable support staff) to the organizational structure simply drains resources that could be better spent on direct service activities or special initiatives with external groups.

Staff Officer Approach

Institutions that choose to appoint a staff officer to provide leadership for professional service assume that coordination, advocacy, and special attention are needed but that line responsibilities for this area of activity are best carried through the academic structure. A staff appointment can be made either at the multicampus systems level (e.g. Associate Vice President or Assistant to the President); or, at the campus level, in the office of the chief executive officer (e.g. Assistant to the President) or the office of the chief academic officer (e.g. Assistant or Associate Provost). The level of seniority varies considerably by title and staff size. The amount of power and influence within the institution and hence the

potential for leadership depends on the extent to which the staff officer leads the development of service policies and practices, influences the distribution of resources, and maintains positive relationships with senior line officers.

A staff officer for professional service is usually expected to:

1. Coordinate the professional service function across all units of the university (or all academic units). Encourage and facilitate activity at school and college levels and serve as the campus advocate for professional service.

2. Serve as the initial contact point for external organizations or individuals who wish to discuss professional service with the university. Represent the University with external constituencies.

3. Propose policy and guidelines for professional service within appropriate governance structures and processes.

4. Gather and disseminate information on professional service activity through directories, hot lines, the public press and other means.

5. Develop appropriate and creative ways to recognize and reward professional service by working with faculty groups and academic officers. Provide assessments of faculty service performance to the appropriate academic bodies for purposes of reappointment, promotion, tenure, and merit review.

Again, the specific combination of duties and responsibilities for staff officers will vary with institutions and individuals. Many of the duties and responsibilities for a staff officer, when expressed in writing, appear to be quite similar to those for a senior line officer. There is, however, a considerable difference in practice in the way the responsibilities are carried out. The staff officer for professional service coordinates and advises but lacks the authority to make final determinations about policies and practices. Success often depends on powers of persuasion and the ability to interest faculty members in service activities. In contrast, a line officer for professional service, although also depending heavily on persuasion, has the authority to make binding decisions for the institution and often controls the resources to encourage activity.

There are many advantages to the staff officer approach to service leadership. It allows the university to identify an individual to be concerned with professional service without altering the basic authority distributions within the academic structure from Provost to Dean to Department Chair. It makes it possible to decentralize the service structure and at the same time provide for centralized coordination, advocacy and a contact point for external groups.

There are some disadvantages to the staff approach. A staff service officer may make promises or reach agreements with external groups and/or with faculty members in good faith, but these agreements may be overruled by officers with line authority. Staff members have little influence over the faculty reward system and yet may have encouraged faculty members to engage in service activities not recognized by that reward system.
Staff members may be perceived to have too little seniority to have any real influence over policies and practices within the institution and hence, over time, may become ineffective at coordination and advocacy.

Other Approaches

A few universities choose not to identify a line or staff officer for professional service. Some prefer to assign to the Director of the largest organized public service unit, often extension or continuing education, the role of serving as the institutions advocate and spokesman for professional service. Others charge all academic officers with leadership responsibilities for professional service. These approaches do not result in the specification of duties and responsibilities.

The major advantage of these approaches is that they are inexpensive and don't add further complexity to already complex organizational structures. The major disadvantage is that they make it difficult to ensure adequate attention for professional service. Much of the work that a full time person would do to support the function simply does not get done. External groups may not know where to turn for assistance.

In the end, the President must provide personal leadership for professional service in a manner consistent with the mission of the university. The president also must establish a leadership structure and, in doing so, must make choices between line and staff approaches to leadership. They must seek the right combinations of leadership, organization and structure.

PERSONNEL POLICIES

Personnel issues are always at the forefront of discussions about service because professional service, like teaching and research, is highly labor intensive. In most cases, the university resource made available through professional service is a people resource--the time and attention of faculty and staff members. University choices about personnel policy have important implications for the professional service mission and function because they directly influence the amount, type and quality of service activities.

The most important personnel issue is the issue of faculty involvement in professional service activities. This is usually related to the question of faculty reward systems. Universities struggle to develop salary and merit policies that will encourage and reward professional service activity.[6] But it is even more fundamentally related to the question of university expectations for faculty activity. Universities debate whether to expect all members of the faculty to engage in professional service or to expect only some faculty members to perform public service. The choice establishes important parameters of personnel policy and directly influences service activities.

Professional Service As Responsibility of All Faculty Members

Universities that expect all faculty members to engage in service assume that professional service is a natural extension of professional expertise and that service naturally complements other areas of faculty activity. Such universities tend to emphasis the definition of service as outreach, as the performance of specialized teaching and research activities for external groups. Universities that expect all faculty members to engage in professional service argue that the institutional obligation for service becomes the individual obligation of members of the university community. As a matter of fairness and equity, if professional service is part of the university expectation of employment for some faculty, then the same expectations should hold for all faculty members. For individual faculty members, the nature and the quantity of service activity may vary over time depending upon individual needs and other responsibilities, but the university has the right to establish and enforce the basic obligation.

The advantages of this approach are that it allows for the development of clear and uniform personnel policies and emphasizes an expectation that policies will be implemented in a consistent manner for all faculty members. Each faculty member can be expected to engage in, and document, professional service activities. Personnel and salary actions will be based in part on these activities.

A consistent expectation of service for all faculty members also makes it easier to mesh procedures for the review of faculty service productivity with those for the review of teaching and research productivity. Faculty service performance can be reviewed by the same faculty groups and academic officers. In addition, if all faculty members are involved in professional service activity, the overall involvement of the university will be quite extensive.

---

[6]As noted earlier, faculty reward issues are not discussed in this paper. See Elman and Smock (1985).

There are, however, many disadvantages associated with expecting all members of the faculty to engage in professional service activity. Perhaps the most important is the simple fact that not all faculty members are good at it. Excellent teachers and researchers could waste their time performing indifferent service, to the detriment of the individual and the institution. The university may not want all of its faculty members to be involved with external groups.

Another disadvantage is that such an approach fails to recognize important differences across academic fields. The professional service possibilities and external needs for service are simply not as pressing in some arts and science areas as they are in many professional fields. Also, forcing faculty members to engage in service activity against their will could result in poor performance or subterfuge in the sense that faculty members could begin to claim all sorts of activity as professional service. This will lead to enormous confusion among external groups and increase the difficulty of distinguishing important and high quality service.

Professional Service As Responsibility of Some Faculty Members

The alternative approach for universities is to expect that only some faculty members will engage in professional service activity. The assumption of this choice is that it is possible to fulfill the university obligation and responsibility through a set of activities involving only a portion of the faculty. Over time, most members of the faculty may engage in service activities, but at any given time only a portion of the total faculty will be involved in professional service.

The advantage of this approach is that it builds the service program from faculty strengths and interests. The professional services which result from the aggregate of individual faculty choices represent the best the university has to offer to external organizations and groups. This approach also gives academic officers at department and school levels more flexibility to manage the faculty resource. They can take advantage of particular faculty strengths and interests in one of the three areas of teaching, research, or service by allowing more intensive activity in that area and encourage a different profile for other faculty members. The department or school as a whole can develop a balanced mix of teaching, research and service activity without forcing individual faculty members to engage in all three activities concurrently.

One of the disadvantages associated with requiring professional service of only some faculty members is that it creates differing institutional expectations for faculty members that are difficult to explain, defend in terms of fairness and equity, and enforce. Individualized expectations require different reward systems and different processes of performance review. Once separate systems are created, conflicts are created with other means of academic review and reward.

Questions about what "counts" more for faculty advancement--publication or professional service--become inevitable and difficult to answer.
The institutional choice of requiring all or only some faculty members to engage in professional service activities, then, has special significance for faculty personnel policies. It also poses a serious dilemma for academic leaders. In contrast to many of the other choices discussed here, it cannot be resolved by the appropriate combination of approaches, by adopting mid-positions along a continuum. Institutions must decide what to state as faculty expectation and what to enforce.

RESOURCES

When university presidents and public service officials are asked about barriers to professional service, they invariably respond that the biggest problem is resources. It is difficult for many institutions to find the resources to maintain present levels of service activity. It is almost impossible for them to respond to new requests for professional services if the requests are from groups unable to cover the full costs of the activity. Balancing obligations to teaching, research and service has always been a difficult problem in higher education, it has become especially severe as both fiscal constraints and external demands for service increase.

In response to fiscal conditions, many universities have begun to emphasize professional services that generate revenues, just as they concentrate on research activities that are externally funded. Partnerships with business and industry, economic development projects and faculty consulting for private enterprise are encouraged because it is readily accepted that private, profit-making enterprises should compensate university faculty members and institutions for the value of the professional expertise. Determining the "appropriate" level of compensation is no easy matter but the principle is well established. It is usually argued that such service activities and relationships also serve a public good in that they help build a base for full employment, help United State companies compete successfully with foreign enterprises, and contribute to a healthy economy.

Most private universities have moved in this direction and pubic institutions have done so as well. Public universities, however, also continue to emphasize the land grant and state university idea of service. Public universities face a special dilemma in determining the appropriate posture vis a vis their state governments on the issue of resources for professional service. They must decide whether to assume that service is part of their normal obligation for which the state provides support through its regular appropriation to the university or whether to assume that professional service expectations represent additional and new demands on the university which should be provided for with additional resources through separate line items within the state budget. It is essentially a choice of paid or free service. The remainder of this section treats the paid or free service choice with

respect to the state budget and does not consider the issue of fees for professional service to profit making businesses and industries.

Institutions rarely orient their approach to resources from state government entirely toward paid service or toward free service. They usually combine both. Some even utilize what has been called the "Robin Hood"[7] approach-- charging what the market will bear to some external groups in order to accumulate resources that make free services to more disadvantaged groups possible. Universities do, however, establish an overall institutional orientation and expectation that emphasizes paid or free service. New requests for professional service often provide opportunities to revisit the question and to decide again whether to respond with free service or to charge for time and expenses. Decisions about resources, in turn, have important implications for relationships with external constituencies, for policies and for organizational structures. They influence the nature and scope of the university's professional service activity as well as attitudes and expectations for service.

The Paid Service Approach

Universities which choose the paid service approach assume that financial resources must be provided by external groups and individuals to cover the costs of service activities. Financial provisions are handled in a number of ways. Universities can insist on a direct line-item appropriation from state government to support the costs of large direct service units such as an Institute for Government or a Technical Advisory Service. State universities that seek state line item support for direct service units also continue to require some state "hard money" support for the infrastructure for public service (i.e. the offices that coordinate service activity and link the university with external groups, publications for dissemination of information about service activities and so forth). Some large service units such as Divisions of Continuing Education generate income through fees and are required by the university to be self supporting. Institutions enter into contractual arrangements with external agencies or business firms for individual projects and activities. Combinations of these mechanisms are found in most public universities.

A major advantage of the paid service approach is that it allows the instructional budget of the institution to be used for instructional and academic support purposes and reduces internal conflicts over resource allocations. The paid service approach also recognizes the value of the university/faculty resource. Charging for professional assistance and service helps ensure that faculty expertise will be

---

[7] The phrase is credited to David Ames, Dean, College of Urban Affairs and Public Policy, University of Delaware.

appreciated and used appropriately by external groups. When applied to direct service units supported by state line item appropriation, this suggests that the visibility and stature of the direct service units, as well as their ability to fulfill their mandated purposes, is directly enhanced by the direct state appropriation.

Another advantage to this approach is that paid service potentially increases the amount of service activity by making it possible for faculty members to be compensated for service activities during the summer months. Arguments that faculty service activity ought to be considered as part of normal work expectations and therefore ought not to be directly compensated rarely acknowledge that most faculty members are employed on academic year appointments. The summer months afford real opportunities for work on service projects provided that external support is available for the projects.

There are also some disadvantages to the paid service approach. It creates an image problem for the institution by sending a message to external groups, including and, perhaps especially, state agencies and state government, that the university is primarily concerned with resource acquisition. This makes it difficult, perhaps even hypocritical, to spotlight service activities in connection with the budget request for general state support. A second disadvantage is that the paid service approach can operate to relieve faculty of their sense of obligation for professional service.

It is also possible that the paid service approach can distort the overall direction and substance of university professional service activity. It has been argued persuasively that universities are among the few remaining social institutions with sufficient distance from social, political, and economic forces to address basic questions of societal values and they are among the few with enough independence to pursue directions of their own choosing (Wolfe, 1969; Ashby,1971; Martin,1977; Bok, 1982). While this debate goes far beyond the service function per se, it does suggest that universities are perhaps in a unique position to undertake worthwhile activities and to apply professional expertise to important questions of the day even when others are not willing to provide the resources for these activities and investigations. Universities that respond only to those who can pay may, over the long run, miss important obligations for professional service.

The Free Service Approach

Universities using the free service approach do not charge public agencies, non-profit groups, state agencies, or most individuals for professional services. They may charge, and/or expect their faculty to charge certain groups or individuals (e.g. profit making businesses, individuals taking off-campus courses) for services when

no public benefit is associated with the activity, but, in that case, the activity is not described as public/professional service.

Institutions choosing the free service approach assume first, that the basic financial support provided by state government includes support for professional service; and second, that service activity is part of the normal faculty obligation compensated by regular salary. The operating costs of service units are built into the regular state budget request and no special appropriations or separate line items are requested.

There are many advantages associated with the free service method of providing for service. It fosters a positive relationship between the university and state government. Governors and legislatures like the "Wisconsin Idea" associated with the land grant tradition that the major state university has a special obligation to serve the needs of the state and its citizens, and that the boundaries of the university are coterminous with the boundaries of the state (Ashby, 1971). Many believe that free service influences state officials to increase the state appropriation to the University and thus free service potentially increases the levels of support for instruction and other activities.

Another advantage is that free service fosters strong relationships between university faculty and professional personnel in state agencies. State agency personnel are more likely to turn to the university for assistance if free services are provided, than if agency personnel must find resources within constrained agency budgets. Collaborative projects with state agencies provide important learning opportunities for faculty and students. The free service approach is also an advantage in that it allows the university to pursue worthy projects and programs for groups not well served by other organizations and establishes an important model for university students of worthy activity and good citizenship.

A major disadvantage of the free service approach is that it can lead to unrealistic external expectations. The university must balance its teaching, research and service obligations but the demands for free services can far exceed the capacity of institutions. Another important disadvantage is that the free service approach may lead the university to simply ignore many important areas of need. Because it is difficult for universities to find the resources within their budgets for the long term and large scale service projects that are necessary for complex social and political problems, such projects may not be undertaken.

Resource questions, then, return us to the heart of the matter of public service in higher education. Is public service an obligation and responsibility for universities which enjoy special privileges and extensive financial support from society or is it

an additional activity to be pursued by faculty members if and when they are willing and for which they, and their universities, receive additional compensation?

A RESEARCH AGENDA

What has been begun here is an effort to distill from a confusing literature and even more confusing set of institutional arrangements, policies and programs the fundamental questions, issues, and choices in the area of public service. It is an attempt to provide the beginnings of a framework within which questions of public professional service can be treated theoretically and then examined through research. Much remains to be done but the work to date suggests the following research questions:

1. From an examination of the way public service is defined and articulated in specific colleges and universities, can it be determined to what extent public service is used rhetorically, narrowly defined in order to differentiate it from teaching and research, or broadly defined to emphasize outreach and dissemination? To what extent do institutions emphasize professional service?

2. To what extent are organizational structures for the public service function centralized or decentralized in specific institutions or groups of institutions? Does extent of centralization or decentralization make a difference in the scope of service activity, the perceptions of external groups, or the perceptions of members of the academic community about service? Does it relate to effectiveness and/or efficiency in the delivery of services?

3. Do leadership structures make a difference? Are Vice Presidents more visible, energetic, dedicated etc. than staff members with coordinating responsibility for service? Are faculty members more responsive to Vice President's, staff members or academic officers? Are they confused by multiple obligations where the service structure is separated from the academic structure?

4. Is there evidence that universities should not expect all faculty members to engage in public service? Can individualized faculty contracts be made to work? Are there incentives that could be used to encourage greater faculty involvement in professional service?

5. Have universities shifted too far in the direction of paid service? Do they no longer consider what is important for society but only who can pay and how much? Are universities in danger of losing vital public support? Are there ways to develop a viable resource base for public service?

These are just a few of the questions about public service in higher education that need to be addressed through research. Case studies, comparative studies and many other methods could be useful but attention to theoretical and conceptual frameworks is important. It is an area crying for theoretical development and sustained research.

REFERENCES

American Association of State Colleges and Universities. Issues in Higher Education and Economic Development. Washington: AASCU, 1986.

Ashby, Eir Eric. Any Person, Any Study: An Essay on Higher Education in the United States. New York: McGraw Hill, 1971.

Bok, Derek. Beyond the Ivory Tower: Social Responsibilities of the Modern University. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982

Crosson, Patricia H. Public Service in Higher Education: Practices and Priorities. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Research Report, No. 7. Washington: Association for the Study of Higher Education, 1983.

Crosson, Patricia H. "Strengthening the Public Service Mission," Thought and Action, Vol 1, No. 2, Spring, 1985, pp. 109-122.

Elman, Sandra E., and Smock, Sue Marx. Professional Service and Faculty Rewards: Toward an Integrated Structure. Washington: D.C. National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, 1985.

Florestano, Patricia S. and Hambrick, Ralph S., Jr. "Rewarding Faculty Members for Professional-Related Public Service." Educational Record, Vol. 65, No. 1, Winter, 1984, pp. 18-21.

Gulko, Warren W. Program Classification Structure. Boulder, CO. National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, 1972.

Lynton, Ernest A. and Elman, Sandra E. New Priorities for the University. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1987.

Lynton, Ernest A., Elman, Sandra E., and Smock, Sue Marx. "Rewarding Professional Activity." Thought and Action, Vol 1, No. 2, Spring, 1985, pp. 101-108.

Martin, Warren Bryan, "Service through Ideas of Value," Redefining Service, Research, and Teaching, New Directions for Higher Education, No.18. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

Wolfe, Robert Paul. The Idea of the University. Boston: Beacon Press, 1969.